UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,107	09/12/2003	Harry Bims	1875.7300003	6489
	7590 08/12/201 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAMINER		
1100 NEW YO	RK AVENUE, N.W.	AJAYI, JOEL		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/661,107	BIMS, HARRY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JOEL AJAYI	2617	

	JOEL AJAYI	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); er form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying t	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324).
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li></ul>			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wi ided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2, 4-17, 19-21, 23-31, 33-35</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10.		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	, , , , ,	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/NICK CORSARO/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617	/Joel Ajayi/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument features determining within the plurality of repeaters whether wirelessly transmitting first and second packets to the first and second mobile stations, respectively will create interference between the first and second packets. The applicant states that determination or detection of whether interference will occur before packets are allowed to be transmitted over the wireless network and shows support for this in the specification (par. 196). However, the statement and support provided by the applicant are not in claim 1 for instance. The examiner cannot read the specification into the claims. Given the broadest interpretation, the reference meets the limitations of the claims as disclosed in the final rejection. The applicant needs to include the applicant's points of argument in the claims to highlight the novel features of the invention.

The argument features official notice taken. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Tan is not required to make the case in point. Briskman satisfies this requirement. The examiner only included Tan to help the applicant see that the cited causes for interference are well known in the art. Given the broadest interpretation, Briskman meets the limitations of the claims.

The argument features designated for transmission to a first mobile station and a second mobile station, respectively, via a plurality of repeaters. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Briskman discloses that data is broadcasted from the repeaters (col. 6, lines 43-47) to mobile stations (col. 6, lines 19-22; fig. 1 shows multiple mobile stations).

In view of the above, the rejection using Briskman is maintained.